

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/534,487 03/24/00 REID

L 114231.119

021269  
PEPPER HAMILTON  
600 FOURTEENTH STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005

HM12/0702

EXAMINER

WOITACH, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED:

07/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

File

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/534,487

Applicant(s)

Reid, L.M. et al.

Examiner

Joseph T. Woitach

Group Art Unit

1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph T. Woitach

(3) Thor Neilson

(2) Karen M. Hauda (SPE)

(4) Corine M. Pouliquen

Date of Interview Jun 13, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:  
None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants inquired about arguments and art needed to overcome the basis of the 112 rejection. It was pointed out that effective filing date of the application is 8/7/91, and that the specification does not provide any working examples of the specific hepatocyte precursor cell nor methods of using a genetically modified cell for any specific treatment liver dysfunction. In the course of the interview, it was acknowledged that the Inventor has proceeded to further characterize the precursor cells, and that the art supports fetal stem/precursor cells to treat a patient in liver failure. In light of the instant specification, it was questioned whether one would know the metes and bounds of what is encompassed by 'hepatocyte precursor cell', or how to obtain one. It was concluded that arguments and art should indicate how, at the time of filing, one of skill in the art could have practiced the claimed methods of treatment with a reasonable expectation of success and without undue experimentation using the instant specification.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

*Karen M. Hauda*  
KAREN M. HAUDA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.